LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor: R. Palme Dutt

LABOUR'S ASSIZES

The Editor

★

INCOMES POLICY

Leo McGree

★

WILLIAM GALLACHER 1881-1965

★

Subversion in the Trade Unions — J. Williamson

Nuclear Bombs at Geneva — Quaestor

Who is the Leper Now? — D. Nandy

SEPTEMBER 1965

Two Shillings

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

VOL. XLVII No. 9 SEPTEMBER . 1965

CONTENTS

Page

Notes of the Month: Labour's Assizes. *Industrial and Political Wings—We Are All In It Together—Policy the Crux—Revealing Agenda—Foreign Policy and Vietnam in the Foreground—Whose Decisive Voice?—Singapore Shock—Dominos' Downfall—The New 'Anti-Imperialists'?—Late Learners—Not So Fast—Reality of Imperialism—The 'Bonus'—Imperialist Loot—'Stop Thief!'—The Fight Ahead—Accept No Substitutes—Foreign and Home Policy* ..... **R.P.D.** 385

Incomes Policy. A witty and forthright reply to the exponents of wage restraint ..... **Leo McGree** 398

Nuclear Bombs At Geneva. A guiding thread through the maze of evasions and hypocrisy created by the western powers over disarmament ..... **Quaestor** 402

William Gallacher 1881-1965. A farewell tribute to one of the greatest sons of the working class of our time. 408

Subversion in the Trade Unions. An exposure of the real disrupters at work in the international trade union movement **J. Williamson** 411

Highlights of the Trades Union Congress, 1925..... 416

Who Is the Leper Now? An analysis of the White Paper on Commonwealth Immigration and its real meaning.....**D. Nandy** 418

Forty Years Ago. *Plus ça change . . .* 423

Going Back to Odessa. A warm, personal account of Jewish life in the U.S.S.R. today.....**Judah Waten** 424

Nationalisation: A Live Issue. A reminder of the strength of the working class demand for common ownership. 429

Book Review: 'Redundancy and the Railwaymen'. Dorothy Wedderburn: *Dave Bowman.* 431

Colour Blind..... .....**Helen Falber** 432

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

LABOUR'S ASSIZES

The British Labour Government, if it becomes a tool of Wall Street, will become a menace to the world.
WILLIAM GALLACHER. 'A Year of Labour Government', *Labour Monthly*, August, 1946.

August 16, 1965

The hour of testing and showdown is at hand. This month of September will see the Trades Union Congress at its beginning and the Labour Party Conference at its close. There may have been more dramatic moments of direct confrontation during the close on a century record of the Trades Union Congress or two thirds of a century of the Labour Party Conference. But never have there been such grave questions of deep and lasting import for the whole future of Britain and of the British labour movement. The questions confronting both gatherings are in fact the same. The central question of the attitude to be taken to the record and policies of the present Labour Government under the premiership of Harold Wilson, contemporary successor of the previous Labour Governments of Ramsay MacDonald and Clement Attlee, inheriting the same basic problems of British imperialism in decline, only now at a more advanced stage, and so far attempting the same disastrous solutions. The question of the economic situation and future of Britain, declining in the world level, and dogged by chronic deficits in the balance of payments. The incomes policy of Brown and the credit squeeze and the cuts of Callaghan, recalling the previous wage-freeze and austerity of Cripps in the last Labour Government. The war in Vietnam, recalling Korea, and the costly overseas military adventures with their adverse effects on the balance of payments. The crippling arms burden, now reaching its record peacetime height, and the consequent postponement of hopes of social advance. It is all a familar story. But we are today further along the road.

Industrial and Political Wings

How irrelevant, in the light of this situation, the attempts still voiced, and sometimes even increasingly voiced, to separate the industrial and political wings of the movement, and urge the Trades Union Congress to confine its attention to industrial matters and leave political matters as the sphere of the Labour

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Party. All the biggest questions facing both are the same, as a glance at the agenda of the two gatherings would show. Of course it is understandable that some of the newer professional unions, who are not yet affiliated to the Labour Party, and who have only after considerable hesitation and internal debate won the assent of their membership to join the T.U.C.—and their accession is a most welcome sign of the times—should at the moment urge the confinement of the T.U.C. to 'industrial' questions outside the political arena, so as to maintain their 'non-political' or 'non-party-political' character. This is of course what the most vocal representatives of Toryism and big business ceaselessly urge; for they would dearly like to see the Americanisation of the British trade union movement. John Williamson's article in the current number on 'Subversion in the Trade Unions', exposing the sinister international rôle of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. right-wing leadership in association with the State Department and Central Intelligence Agency, throws a lurid light on what this means. When the Tory and big business spokesmen advocate 'non-political' trade unionism, to be disassociated from the Labour Party, they mean abandonment of the aim of socialism and close co-operation with big business, along the lines for which today Neddy is the form and model, like Mondism during the generation between the wars.

We Are All In It Together

But the facts of life in Britain defeat such plans. All the Neddies will pass into limbo like Mondism—although the battle between the working class socialist consciousness and class co-operation will continue in successive forms right up to the final victory of the working class and socialism. The professional unions can no more escape politics than their brethren in industry. The teachers, the scientists, the technicians, all are now swimming in the high tide of politics and political questions, not merely concerning their salaries and conditions, but, inevitably bound up with these, equally the whole prospect of their work and rôle in society, involving all the questions of national finance and the allocation of national finance or questions of social organisation—that is, political questions. The finance available for health and research and education depends on the finance allocated for Malaysia and Aden and Nato and H bombs. This has become obvious to all. There can be no artificial separation into 'non-political' and 'political' compartments.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Towards Closer Co-operation

So far from the present situation justifying artificial separation of different sections or organisations of the working people, the urgency of the present situation calls for much closer co-operation of all sections. It calls for the ending of the bans which in the name of the old notorious Hitlerite slogans of 'anti-communism' seek to divide the workers, violate working-class democracy and prevent communist and non-communist workers from serving common aims together in the mass working-class organisations. The urgent need today is for a common front of all socialists, communists, trade unionists, co-operators, members of professional organisations and all prepared to co-operate with them, to meet the common urgent problems of the present international and home situation, defeat the war policies and win the way forward for social advance.

Policy the Crux

The same consideration applies to those voices in the Labour Party which proclaim the demand to 'liberate' the Labour Party from being tied to the trade unions and profess to regard, most often for ultra-right reasons of hostility to class politics, but sometimes also for would-be left reasons of impatience, the unions as a dead-weight impeding the advance of the Labour Party. But the measure of advance in the political situation in Britain during this past half century, contrasting with the immediately preceding nineteenth century conditions or the situation in the United States with the absence there so far of a political labour movement; the fact that Labour Governments have become possible, even though so far only right-wing Labour Governments and not governments of fundamental social change; the initial modification to this extent of the old two-party system to be compelled to take on a certain form and appearance of a class confrontation, even though the content still belies the form, but also this frustration becomes a spur to further development: all this has only been possible because the unions have entered directly as organisations into the political field to act through their own party. When the Amalgamated Engineering Union, in this year's T.U.C. agenda declares in a resolution, aimed to mobilise support for the Labour Government, that 'without 100 per cent support of the industrial wing no Labour Government could hope to implement its electoral programme', the principle here expressed is in itself correct. But such support cannot be automatic. Support depends on policy. This is the crucial question ignored in the A.E.U.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resolution. The crucial question is the policy of the Labour Government.

Revealing Agenda

A glance at the preliminary agenda equally of the T.U.C. and of the Labour Party Conference reveals the nature of the problems arising. Of the 85 resolutions on the T.U.C. agenda no less than eleven are concerned with the Government's Incomes Policy; all express some form of criticism, from downright rejection in the case of two (the Watermen and the Boilermakers), to dissatisfaction with the failure to control rising prices in the case of others, to demands for extended public ownership as a condition of support in the case of others. Similarly in the 387 resolutions of the Labour Conference agenda. Under the heading of 'the Labour Government' four dutiful resolutions are set out expressing 'congratulations' and 'support' and ascribing all difficulties to the legacy of Tory rule. But thereafter in every concrete sphere of policy the flood of criticism and dissatisfaction bursts forth. Immediately after the four resolutions of generalised 'congratulations', the section on Housing, Rents and Building follows, with 38 resolutions, pouring out a tale of woe, urgent demands and even complaints of 'failure' of the Labour Government, and not a single resolution of congratulation in this concrete sphere. Similarly with the 33 resolutions on health; 12 on education; 17 on the incomes policy, all expressing concern at the rise in prices; or 17 on transport, with the major unions here intervening to express themselves as 'disturbed at the lack of progress in the formulation of a national transport policy' (N.U.R.), condemning the 'failure of the Government' to halt closures and emphasising the 'urgency' of a national transport policy (A.S.L.E.F.), or 'gravely concerned with the problems arising from lack of planning and integration of the country's transport system' (T.G.W.U.).

Foreign Policy and Vietnam in the Foreground

But the largest sections of the whole agenda turn on foreign policy, Vietnam and armaments. 47 resolutions are classified under the heading of 'foreign policy'. Every one of these is critical. The great number of them make specific reference to condemn United States policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic and the Government's tailing behind U.S. policy. But in addition 12 more resolutions are classified under the separate heading of 'Vietnam'; and the majority of these further repeat the demand again and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

again for disassociation from support of the policy of the United States. If to these are added 13 resolutions on 'Defence and Disarmament', devoted mainly to emphasising the need for 'drastic cuts' or condemning the retention of the Polaris base, together with 3 on Germany (2 critical of West Germany, and 1 for recognition of the German Democratic Republic), 2 on South Africa and 1 on East-West trade, this constitutes a total of 78 resolutions on foreign policy, Vietnam and armaments. Not one of these 78 resolutions can be regarded as equivalent to support of the Government's foreign policy; the overwhelming majority explicitly condemn it and demand a drastic revision of policy. Typical of the general line is the demand of Coventry South:

> Conference calls on the Government to carry out a reappraisal of its foreign policy, because that policy is running in the American wake, resulting in Britain having to carry a tremendous overseas military burden which is impeding the economic and social expansion expected of a Labour Government.

It is doubtful if any previous agenda in any years has shown so overwhelming a condemnation of a Labour Government's foreign and arms policy and demand for its basic revision.

Whose Decisive Voice?

Of course it can no doubt be claimed by those in leading positions as spokesmen of the Government that these are in the main 'only' resolutions of constituency labour parties and therefore small beer unlikely to carry any decisive weight in the Conference outcome, since in the voluminous array of resolutions of a preliminary agenda the critics are the most vocal and the supporters are usually silent. Even if in the Conference voting the opposition should prove stronger than anticipated, or in the extreme case carry a resolution against the platform, has not the rôle of the Conference in the mechanics of the Labour Party long been devalued by those on top, and since Scarborough explicitly denied any rights of sovereignty? It is only in communist parties that the sovereignty of democratically elected congresses of delegates of the membership is absolute. MacDonald long ago used to pour out his contempt for the rank and file as 'easy-oosie asses'. Only the other day Lord Citrine, the most experienced old-time manipulator of the T.U.C., speaking in the House of Lords on August 4 with reference to the coming Congress, made an open call to the trade union leaders to resist their membership:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Next month the T.U.C. were going to meet, and already on the agenda there is an open challenge to the policy. It is time for trade union leaders to make a stand against pressure from their own members.
>
> (*The Times* report, August 5, 1965.)

Nevertheless, the views of the rank and file are important, even in a reformist-led labour movement. These conferences are the only democratic, or at any rate partially democratic (since in the Labour Party Conference democratic freedom of choice of delegates by the major constituent organisations is barred) assizes of the movement, where the great battles of policy must be fought. And the leadership know that they cannot entirely and indefinitely ignore the wishes of the membership without endangering their own position.

Singapore Shock

Further, the impact of events again and again reinforces the otherwise weak voices of the critics, can compel drastic revisions of policy, and expose the bankruptcy of old policies. The whole record of these first ten months of the Labour Government, with the ceaseless abrupt changes, retreats and new expedients to meet successive phases of crisis, has demonstrated the disastrous consequences of the Tory-Labour imperialist foreign and arms policy inherited and carried forward by the Labour Government. These consequences cannot be indefinitely concealed under cover of glib references to the heritage of thirteen years of Tory rule, since every one can see that they are in fact the consequences, not of thirteen years, but of twenty years of bi-partisan Tory-Labour imperialist foreign, cold war and arms policy. And now today on the very eve of the crucial September conferences the sudden break-up expressed in the separation of Singapore from the artificial reactionary Federation of 'Malaysia' has brought a new situation. All progressive opinion recognised at the time of its creation only two years ago the artificial reactionary character of this Federation, concocted by British imperialism to maintain the base of Singapore and domination in South-East Asia, and taken over by the Labour Government for the same aims. Today this break-up has not only exposed the instability of this artificial Federation. It has brought a new situation whose repercussions are extending over the entire field of British imperialist strategy.

Dominos' Downfall

The new situation is universally recognised as bringing in question the whole future of the base of Singapore. But more than that. It has

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in fact brought in question the entire Anglo-American imperialist strategy in this region, built on the foundation of a massive concentration of military forces and armaments and warships and bombers and continuous parallel military action in 'Malaysia' and Vietnam to hold up the advance of national liberation in South-East Asia. At the same time the breakdown of the spurious negotiations over Aden, and of the equally artificial 'South Arabian Federation', concocted to maintain the Aden base, has brought in question the whole future in that region also. The warning lesson for the coming Conferences is inescapable. It may be possible for a short time to silence or out-manoeuvre the voices of critics in a conference. Reality cannot so easily be silenced or out-manoeuvred.

The New 'Anti-Imperialists'?

In an examination of 'Defence After Singapore' the *Financial Times* on August 10 wrote that the separation of Suez from the Federation represented 'a blow to British foreign policy' and 'the end of a long phase of British policy'. The article recalls how, as national independence has advanced in the former British colonial territories, 'British strategy' has been to arrange federal structures, partly as a means to 'subject the wilder elements' to 'restraint'.

> This policy was adopted in the West Indies, in Central Africa and in the Far East, and is being attempted in Aden. In every case the effort has failed, or is on the point of breaking down. Trying to bludgeon countries into an alliance they do not want has been largely a waste of time.

But this in turn raises the entire question of 'the whole string of bases that the United Kingdom maintains around the world at a foreign exchange cost of £300 million. This military establishment . . . cannot count on a long political life'. The now increasingly favoured alternative is examined for 'the transfer at huge cost' of these bases to a chain of remote islands and Australia in the fond belief that this would mean 'security of tenure'. 'But any such move', it is pointed out, 'would raise the fundamental question whether Britain should be exchanging Eastern bases or abandoning them'. And then follows the supreme and deadly argument of cost, which is compelling this 'new thinking':

> The unique string of bases that Britain has maintained from the Persian Gulf to the Far East is costing more than the balance of payments can possibly bear; political unheavals are leading the military to spend more and more time defending the bases themselves. Political developments are now forcing the British to give up something that they cannot afford. Maybe it is an opportunity to grasp.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

O worthy Gradgrind, true to the last to your sole argument of the exchequer. Not morality, but cost is drumming the truth of the bankruptcy of imperialism into the heads of the imperialists.

Late Learners

Now that the new gospel of the ruinous cost and bankruptcy of the whole system of overseas military bases is beginning to be repeated in the most orthodox imperialist quarters, which nearly two decades ago were clamouring treason when the Communists and the left during the Attlee Labour Government were alone in exposing this basic factor in Britain's chronic deficit in the balance of payments, the tale has begun to be taken up even by the most notorious ultra-right Labour M.P.s. Harold 'East-of-Suez' Wilson may soon be in danger of finding himself out on a limb. On August 10 the bold, audacious *Mirror*, always so fearless to strike up the tune after the band is in full play, denounced the 'charade' of the 'East of Suez' policy. On the same day that no less doughty organ of the millionaires, the *Mail*, was peremptorily demanding a review of the entire overseas military expenditure which was proving so ruinous to the balance of payments. And to add the final touch of comic relief, like the harlequinade at the end of the melodrama, the egregious Woodrow Wyatt is given the lush pastures of a full page of the *Sunday Mirror* on August 15 to proclaim his pearl of new-found wisdom under the heading 'The Great Illusion':

> Without the money we squander on keeping forces abroad we would have no balance of payments deficit this year and we would show a handsome profit next year. . . . We cannot afford this imperialist hangover which makes us think we have to pay to police the world. . . . Because we are not free of our imperialist mental make-up, we think we must dabble in everything even when it does not remotely concern us.
>
> We squander so much foreign exchange on military bases we do not need that we have to borrow hugely from the Americans. That makes it impossible for us to tell them publicly they are now about to make bloody fools of themselves in Vietnam.

O Daniel come to judgement! But where was Mr. Wyatt when the Communist Party was alone among the political parties in proclaiming these elementary truths of Britain's economic position during last year's general election, or already many years ago when its Eighteenth Congress in November 1945 was already warning that this policy would wreck the Attlee Labour Government?

Not So Fast

Before the left throw their hats in the air and regard the battle as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

won with these resounding declarations, like the similar jubilation over the unanimous official acceptance of Frank Allaun's motion in the Parliamentary Labour Party for 'drastic cuts in arms expenditure much earlier than at present proposed', it is necessary to sound a warning note and recall a few facts of the real situation, including the continuing reality of British imperialism. In the first place, the Government and official policy, in all the desperate attempts to prune the figures and make housekeeping savings in the costs of overseas military expenditure, is by no means interpreting this in terms of abandoning the system of overseas military bases and commitments. Indeed, one of the latest ingenious hand-outs of the Ministry of Defence has been to provide a comically elaborate statistical 'proof' that it would cost more to bring the troops home than to maintain them abroad. Pressed by Mr. Heath on the day after the official acceptance of Frank Allaun's motion for 'drastic cuts much earlier than at present proposed' to state whether this acceptance meant any change in the Government's policy, Mr. Wilson protected himself with the evasive answer, committing to no new departure in policy:

> We have decided the defence review must be contained within a total of £2,000 million at 1964 prices. That review is continuing. Depending on what commitments are involved, and what decisions the Government take on these commitments, if we can get it below £2,000 million we certainly shall do so.

The principle of 'commitments' remains. Previously on February 1 Mr. Wilson had admitted in parliament that the 'total in-built costs' of 'our forces East of Suez' amounted to £500 million a year.

Reality of Imperialism

Why this tenacity to maintain these costly commitments, when it has now become clear to all that they are ruining Britain economically and that their consequences in crippling home economic and social development and frustrating fulfilment of the promises of the electoral programme are threatening to bring down the Labour Government? Is it simple obstinacy? Is it the 'imperialist hangover' and persistence of an 'imperialist mental make-up' in the terms of the *Sunday Mirror* scribe? This psychological language is a characteristic delusion. Imperialism is not just a psychological phenomenon. Imperialism is an economic phenomenon. When the familiar contention of the Woodrow Wyatt type of article (and the same simplified calculation is sometimes presented by left critics of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government's policy and sincere anti-imperialist spokesmen) that the cancellation of overseas military expenditure could abolish the deficit on the balance of payments and even bring a 'handsome profit' by next year, this calculation is based on the assumption that the profits of imperialism, the vast overseas net income from the 'invisible' earnings will continue unchanged on the positive side of the account, while the costs of imperialism are removed from the negative side. But this assumption is a dangerous assumption. It is certainly not shared by the masters of Britain's policy, whose imperialist requirements are carried out by Mr. Wilson and his Ministers. It is time for the left to reach a more adequate understanding of the real character of Britain's parasitic imperialist economy, if they are not to be taken by surprise as the further developments of Britain's crisis unfold themselves. The burden of overseas military expenditure is a symptom of this crisis, not its cause.

The 'Bonus'

In a recent article on the movement in 'he terms of trade during the past years, Lombard in the *Financial Times* of July 19 made a calculation of interest, which throws light on the extent of increasing imperialist exploitation and the super-profits through this form alone drawn by the United States, Britain and other leading Western imperialist countries.

> Since 1957 alone—and the primary producing countries as a whole were losing ground on the terms of trade front for several years before that—the industrialised countries have derived a saving of the order of $7,000 million per annum from the decline in their import prices. The rise in their export prices has added some $3-4,000 million to their foreign exchange earnings over the same period. So they can be said to have enjoyed a bonus of some $10,000 million to $11,000 million per annum at the expense of the rest of the world—a bonus they have done nothing to earn.

This 'bonus' to the Western imperialist countries from intensified exploitation through the movement of the terms of trade (reflecting the stronger bargaining position of the imperialist monopolies in contrast to the weakness of the peasant farmers in a colonial economy) has more than cancelled out the entire 'aid' during the same period, not only governmental and institutional aid or loans, but also including private capital investment. The writer calculated in the same survey that the total of all forms of aid from the Western countries during the same period, whether grants or loans, whether bilateral or multilateral or through international organisations or

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all forms of private capital investment, amounted to 'not much in excess of $10,000 million per annum, if as much'—that is, less than the 'bonus they have done nothing to earn' extracted from the primary producing countries, mainly colonial or ex-colonial, by the Western imperialist countries.

Imperialist Loot

But this is only one part of the picture. The so-called 'aid', apart from covering mainly military or direct commercial exploiting interests of imperialism or subsidies to maintain reactionary régimes against the peoples, is an unreal total, since it suffers an annually increasing proportion of deduction for payment of interest or repayment on previous loans. On the other hand, the unearned 'bonus' of $10-11,000 million a year is only an estimate of the spoils of exploitation through this one form alone. It leaves out of account the large totals of net income from interest and profit on overseas capital or overseas operations of the monopolies and the many other forms of 'invisible' income from financial commissions and the like. The last balance of payments return for 1964 shows a net 'property income from abroad' totalling £768 million (£1,352 million received against £584 million paid out). In addition, the recent book by the financial journalist W. P. Clarke *The City in the World Economy* has estimated for last year '£185 million invisible earnings brought in by the city' (*The Times,* July 30, 1965). All this represents directly recorded income from the overseas operations of British imperialism. But the profits of the biggest imperialist monopolies, when their headquarters and part of their operations are in Britain, appear as profits of British companies in Britain, although their source comes overwhelmingly from imperialist exploitation. Glaring is the case of oil which we had occasion to analyse in July under the heading 'Coal, Oil and Britain'. In a recent circular to shareholders Shell writes:

> There is a belief in some quarters that oil is an exceptional burden on the U.K. balance of payments. In fact, apart from the Netherlands, Britain is the only country lacking large oil resources of its own that is relieved of the greater part of the net foreign exchange cost of its oil requirements. This is because of the world-wide operations of the two international oil enterprises based in this country, Shell and British Petroleum.
>
> Between 1954 and 1964 the United Kingdom obtained through Shell alone net imports of oil worth about £1,200 million for a net foreign exchange outflow of only some £150 million.

In other words, £1,050 million in pocket through this alone. Another

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

slice of the imperialist loot hidden in the balance of payments accounts. No wonder that the official economists and statisticians have never attempted to assess publicly the total proportion which the myriad forms of income from imperialist exploitation play in the British economy.

'Stop Thief!'

These partial indications of the very large volume of overseas exploitation, far exceeding the total of 'aid' or overseas capital investment, as the foundation of the whole structure of Britain's imperialist economy throw an ironic light on the vast display advertisements which well-meaning philanthropists have contributed to flourish in all the British capitalist press to solicit charity for the poor exploited countries under the inappropriate title 'Stop Thief!'

STOP THIEF!

> Would any of us willingly stand by and allow a thief to rob a child? Millions of children are robbed daily of health and happiness. Robbed even of life itself in the poorer countries of the world.

At this point the innocent reader might imagine that he was being offered a subversive and inflammatory document from this 'War on Want Campaign Against World Hunger', calling on him to join the battle against imperialist exploitation ('Stop Thief!'). But the next words are careful to remove any such dangerous misconception:

> Not by human thieves, but by the grim cruelty of hunger, disease, ignorance and poverty.

The imperialist multi-millionaires can at this point breath a sigh of relief and cheerfully contribute their mite. The enemies are not 'human thieves'. The enemies are abstractions separated from the social system which produces them.

The Fight Ahead

What follows from this analysis of the imperialist character of Britain's economic structure and of the consequent underlying factors of the chronic recurring crisis conditions of Britain's economic situation and balance of payments? First, that the big monopolists, will never willingly forego their world loot which is for them the basis of their existence. Therefore they will fight to the last and use every manoeuvre within their reach to maintain what they are pleased to call Britain's 'world rôle', both exercised through

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the international functioning of sterling and the City, and backed by armed power deployed in a variety of forms all over the world, no matter what the ruinous cost to Britain's home economy. Second, that in consequence, whatever the retreats compelled by the advance of national liberation, whether through the concession of political independence, or through enforced surrenders of one base to substitute another, they will always, as long as they are able, seek successive alternative forms to maintain their world power and exploitation as for them the indispensable basis of their existence.

Accept No Substitutes

For this reason the 'new critics' in some highly placed official or semi-official quarters, or in the millionaire press, of the overseas military expenditure and bases as beginning to prove a losing proposition, never in reality propose a clean cut, but always advocate some alternative means of pursuing the same objectives, whether through the last-ditch transfer of bases to remote islands and Australia, or closer military alliance with the United States, or the use of the troops in Germany as a mobile strategic reserve. Therefore the left will need to be on guard against accepting the promised official 'review of military commitments', now offered by the Government as the answer to critics, as if the battle were already won. The real fight to end the overseas military expeditions and bases and commitments, as well as support of the similar American aggression, has still to be fought and won.

Foreign and Home Policy

Third, the fight to end the overseas military expenditure and commitments, now demonstrated in the sight of all as ruinous for Britain's balance of payments, is inseparably bound up with the home fight against the domination of the big monopolies over Britain's economy, and to protect and raise the living standards and social provision for the needs of the people by advancing towards a new and healthy self-supporting non-imperialist basis of Britain's productive economy in the interests of the people. The fight on foreign and home policy is one and cannot be divided. Vietnam; arms; incomes policy; housing and health and education and the needs of the people: all are parts of one fight. All these questions will be in the forefront on the coming battlefields at Brighton and at Blackpool.

R.P.D.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INCOMES POLICY

Leo McGree

'HOW They Held Down Wages' in the July *Labour Monthly* must have stirred up the bitter feelings of those delegates to the T.U.C. who were present to hear Prime Minister Attlee beg the workers to accept the wage freeze policy of Cripps. They also heard the Foreign Secretary Bevin address them on the success of the Cold War, on our special relations with the U.S.A., on how Britain was to remain a great World Power that would challenge the power of the Soviet Union and her satellites, and he became very eloquent in his denunciation of the British Communists, who he said were betraying their country. All who sat and listened to this patriotic drivel now realise that this policy of a British Atom Bomb, Cold War, McCarthyite policy, and wage freeze had one result. It brought down the Labour Government, and made possible the return of the Tories to power in Britain.

Today, following thirteen years of Tory rule, this country is in a sorry state. We are staggering from one crisis to another, and the country is bleeding to death, economically and financially, through rising defence costs.

The Bank of England recently warned the Government that the £800,000,000 borrowed from abroad has only bought time in which to put the country's affairs in order, and they declared that: 'It is essential that the borrowed time is properly used'. The steps they recommend are: 'wage claims must be put off, otherwise spending by the Government and private industry must be postponed'. George Brown has dedicated himself to the task of either securing the support of the Trade Unions to a policy of wage restraint, or, if that fails, to introduce legislation to force the workers to accept a lowering of the standard of living.

He has been described as the most overworked member of the Cabinet—he works fourteen hours a day, seven days a week. So hard is he working in the interests of the country that, falling asleep during a television appearance, he had to take a week off to recover. All this in the interests of strengthening the power of monopoly capitalism, and he urges the monopolies to make more and more profits and so prove their efficiency. It is impossible not to recall the description of another indefatigable negotiator as a 'tired whore, trying to work both sides of the street'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the battle rages in the House of Commons, no quarter being asked by either side. After the great confrontation in the House during which the Prime Minister faced the newly-elected Leader of the Opposition, Heath, across the despatch box, members on both sides shouting and waving order papers, one is entitled to ask, what was the fighting about?

It was a battle between reactionary Tories who after thirteen years of power have brought this country to economic disaster, and a right-wing leadership of the Labour Party on the front benches. Prime Minister Wilson endeavours to prove that he and his right-wing colleagues can govern this country in the interests of monopoly capitalism better than the Tories.

The only difference between this bout in the Commons and all-in wrestling on television is that Wilson and Heath did not have to attend a rehearsal. There was no need for any rehearsal, as both contestants knew beforehand every phoney hold, jab and throw by heart.

Both contestants agree that the cost of our present colossal expenditure on defence, running at £2,120,000,000 per year, must be placed on the backs of the working class, and to this end they are in agreement to lower the living standards of the workers by freezing wages, increasing taxation, increasing production, and increasing prices and profits.

The T.U.C. last year discussed and voted on a Composite Resolution No. 6, under the heading 'Economic Planning and Wages', which was carried by an overwhelming majority. This composite resolution contained the following paragraph:

> This Congress reiterates its opposition to the attempted imposition of an Incomes Policy which has as its aim the restraint of wage and salary increases. It believes that Trade Union negotiations with employers backed by a strong Trade Union organisation and free from arbitrary Government interference, are the most effective mediums for improving living standards and working conditions.

That resolution is still the policy of the T.U.C. until our Congress in a few weeks' time. In the meantime, great publicity has been given to the acceptance by the large vote of the Executives of the 178 trades unions affiliated to the T.U.C. for the proposals submitted by George Brown. If ever there was a 'paper victory', that was one. The rank and file have yet to pass judgment. In the meantime, the hunt is on and *everybody wants to get into the act.*

Harold Wilson sneers at the working class when he refers to clock watching. Who are the clock watchers? The workers in the factories,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shipyards, building sites who do not work the full eight hours per day, or ten hours including overtime. These workers are robbers, robbing the country of valuable production. This statement comes from Harold Wilson who has sat in the Commons since 1945. The House of Commons does not start work until the pubs are shut, the Banks are closed, and the gambling on the Stock Exchange is over for the day. And how many M.P.s have made membership of the House only a part-time job? Many M.P.s spend more time looking after their own private business than attending sittings in the House. Many have retainer fees from business houses to look after the interests of monopoly capitalism, some go on long lecture tours which are very profitable, write for the millionaire press, and such like. Parliament has twenty weeks' holiday out of fifty-two weeks, and Wilson has the nerve to smear the workers in heavy industry as clock watchers. Lord Devlin makes much play of welting on the docks—the poor mutt does not understand that the pace of unloading does not permit the output to continue unless the human beings have a rest spell. In this Parliament, long all-night sittings are responsible for many M.P.s cracking up. What would happen if they were not sitting, but working? R.I.P., I predict.

Let Wilson apply his scientific revolution to the House of Commons and carry out the suggestions of the Lawrence Committee report, 'that M.P.s should be able to discharge their duties without undue financial worry and to live and maintain themselves and their families at a modest but honourable level'. In order that they could make Parliament a full-time job, M.P.s secured a pay rise of £28 16s. per week. They now receive £62 10s. per week, whether they attend or not. This was back-dated to October 16, 1964. The old age pensioners were granted a miserable increase of 12s. 6d. for a single person, 21s. for married couples—post-dated to March 1965.

The Duke of Edinburgh is at it again. At a lunch in London with 120 industrial chiefs in October 1961, the Duke burst forth with: 'I think it is about time we pulled our fingers out'. Now that's a nice thing to say, especially at a lunch. How funny all these great and profound sayings always come out at a lunch or dinner. It must be a powerful 'wallop' that was being supped. Now he's at it again—we must end the outlook of 'I'm alright Jack'. Well, he's alright—great wealth, helicopter to take him to polo games, lunches, etc. And what about the Royal yacht *Britannia*? It cost £4,500,000 in 1954. Since that time it has had eight refits at a cost of over another £500,000. Manned by a crew of 250, its annual running cost is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

£364,000. How's this for a bit of pulling your finger out? The *Britannia* sailed from Westminster Pier to Ipswich, and it took fourteen and a half hours to cover 110 miles. By rail it is sixty miles and would have taken an hour and nine minutes. Doesn't the Duke know that it's quicker by rail, or has Beeching failed completely?

Space does not permit a list of the Royal homes, and their cost of upkeep. Does George Brown not know of the wholesale loss of manpower, of flunkies, ladies in waiting, royal hangers-on, etc., all with their fingers well in? However, events are developing in other Royal houses in Europe, so may I offer a humble piece of advice to Prince Philip: 'Watch it, sailor'.

At the last Congress I mentioned the huge profits of Ferranti from the Bloodhound Missile contract. They were paid £11,700,000 for missiles which cost £6,848,000. The firm have been forced to make repayment, and are not pleased with this prospect. But are they repentant? Not on your life! George Brown does not mean anything to the House of Ferranti.

Our next Congress must make it clear to all that our duty as a T.U.C., defined under Rule 2, 'Objects', is:

> Generally to improve the economic or social conditions of workers in all parts of the world and to render them assistance whether or not such workers are employed or have ceased to be employed.

The Statement of Intent on Productivity, Prices and Incomes, accepted by the unions on April 30, 1965, is in violation of the avowed objects of our Congress. This Declaration of Intent has been introduced with the express purpose of deliberately interfering with the so-called free negotiations of the National Joint Industrial Councils, and the Labour Government's interference in collective bargaining has made a complete farce of industrial negotiations.

Our Congress must face up to its responsibility towards the workers of Britain. Congress must at all times defend and improve their members' living standards, and must resist all efforts to worsen conditions. We must strengthen organisation in the factories, shipyards, docks, mines, etc., and must use our full power to preserve peace.

In this task we must make the trades unions more vigorous, more militant and powerful in fighting monopoly capitalism and assist the working class forward to Socialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NUCLEAR BOMBS AT GENEVA

Quaestor

TWO things stand out about the session of the Geneva Disarmament Committee (the 'Committee of 18') which opened on July 27. One is that, although the British and American Governments had for many weeks been acting as though they were straining at the leash to get there, directly the Soviet Union agreed to do so they found themselves embarrassed and at sixes and sevens. The second is that, on the fundamental questions which menace the world's peace and security, their proposals so far—where they have any—have as on so many previous occasions a delayed-action charge built into them which only a child, or someone wanting to play the part, would fail to notice, and which reduces them to a farce, or worse.

As to the first part, it has been noticed before in these columns that, from very early on, in relations between the big capitalist States and the U.S.S.R., one favourite piece of tactics is to offer proposals which sound well, but which are hastily dropped when the Soviet Government accepts them. The U.S. and British Governments 'have exerted a great deal of effort to win support for a return to Geneva', wrote the *Guardian's* United Nations Correspondent (May 29). The U.S. Administration was 'prepared to go to Geneva at any time, and July 13 had been proposed as a convenient date', cabled *The Times* Washington correspondent (July 2). But on July 14 the Soviet Government said it was ready to go to Geneva on July 20—and right away the West, 'which has been so enthusiastically extolling the virtues of Geneva', in the sarcastic words of the *Guardian* editorial (July 19), asked for a postponement to July 27. 'It appears', continued the article, 'that no one really expected the Russians to start talking'. In fact, 'the West is in some confusion over embryonic new proposals', over which 'the indications are that it will be difficult to agree quickly', added the *Telegraph* Geneva correspondent (July 28). Oblivious of the boasts about being 'prepared at any time', Nicholas Carrill stated roundly, in the *Sunday Times* of August 1, that 'Russia's sudden decision to return to Geneva caught the Western Powers unprepared'.

If after all their 'efforts' the Western Powers really had no proposals ready (unlike the Soviet Union), you might be inclined to draw the conclusion—unless you were a political infant—that they were not taking the Geneva meeting, or disarmament itself, very

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seriously. The unfortunate thing is that you would be right. Of course, when the biggest of them is piling up arms and fighting forces in Vietnam, and swiftly escalating Nazi-like massacre and devastation of the people's hard-won resources there, while the other is applauding it, through Harold Wilson's and Michael Stewart's lips, as loudly as it can, their concern for disarmament in any case takes a lot of believing.

But when you look at the second aspect of the Geneva session—the proposals which the capitalist powers are discussing—it becomes clear that their intentions are not serious at all: except in the sense that it is a serious thing to try and deceive hundreds of millions of people with disarmament talk, when you are in reality making things easier for a third world war.

Take the question of extending the 1963 test-ban treaty so as to cover (necessarily small-scale) underground explosions, which were excluded from that document—and thus putting a big barrier in the way of keeping horror weapons fresh, up-to-date and ever ready for nuclear war. On Monday, May 24, *The Times* diplomatic correspondent printed the following information, which could become historic:

> Sir John Cockcroft, the former director of the Atomic Energy Research Establishment at Harwell, said on Saturday that in his opinion the political advantages to be gained from a complete test ban treaty not including a right of on-site inspection now outweigh the military risk of dropping the requirement—which the western Powers have always maintained up to now—that some on-site inspection is essential.
>
> Sir John, who is a member of the advisory panel recently set up by Lord Chalfont, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs with special responsibility for disarmament, was speaking at a weekend conference at Steyning, Sussex, organised by the United Nations Association.
>
> He made it clear that this was a personal opinion, but he backed it up with evidence of the progress recently made in the science of detecting and identifying small underground tests by instruments placed at a great distance. . . .
>
> The new technique involves using arrays of 100 seismographs, information theory, and the choice of quiet sites for the seismograph arrays. By these means small underground explosions and even much smaller earthquakes can be detected with an accuracy of about 10 kilometres at a range of up to 7,000 miles.
>
> Additional interest is lent to Sir John Cockcroft's views by the six-day visit to Russia which he paid last month as guest of the Soviety Academy of Science.

The correspondent added that, if western governments were ready to fall in with these views, a comprehensive test-ban treaty 'should be readily negotiable'. The *Economist*, on May 29, reminded readers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that similar conclusions by two leading American atomic scientists, Wiesner and York, were put forward in the *Scientific American* last October.

But would the western governments fall in with these views? Not likely ! Just as for months they found excuses for not agreeing to stop any tests without inspection—long after the scientists had shown that detection was possible—they stuck fast once again on the necessity of inspection: moreover, throwing up all kinds of smokescreens. Thus, the *Observer* diplomatic correspondent (undoubtedly on the basis of Foreign Office information) said on July 4: 'The British now believe that a complete nuclear test ban could be effective without on-site inspection', and blamed the Americans for obstruction 'for political reasons'. But on July 6, pressed by a Tory member, Harold Wilson revealed that the British were opposing too. After admitting that Cockcroft speaks 'with very great authority', he said: 'Our view—the advice we have—is that we have not yet reached the point where we can safely rely on external verification'. This was the same as the attitude taken up at the opening of the Geneva meeting by the chief American delegate Mr. William Foster: and by Mr. Wilson once more on August 4, when right-wing Labour members like Henderson and Paget asked him how small underground tests could possibly present any real risk, or shift the balance of strength.

Neither Wilson nor Foster attempted to explain why the Soviet Union, which has just as much to lose from nuclear attack as the U.S.A. and Britain, is willing to take that 'risk', while they are not. The basic insincerity of their attitude becomes thereby quite transparent. They are haggling as though they were horse dealers, for ulterior political motives; yet the issue is one involving the greatest perils to mankind.

Take the question of an agreement for non-dissemination of nuclear weapons.

By June 7, according to the diplomatic correspondent of *The Times* on that day, the British Government had put into treaty form a unaminous decision of the United Nations' General Assembly, calling upon all States 'to refrain from any step which might facilitate the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear States'. On July 17 he stated that the draft was now being discussed by Britain's allies in Nato. On July 22 Lord Chalfont told the British press that the 'overriding need' for the world was to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons: and in Paris on July 26 he spoke (at the Nato

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Council) of its 'greatest urgency'. At the Geneva meeting itself, three days later, he said: 'It is not too extreme to suggest, with all seriousness, that this assembly may be our last chance . . . If we miss our opportunity, we could well find ourselves reaching a point of no return'.

Very well, then. The Soviet Union has long ago declared its readiness to sign a treaty completely banning the dissemination of nuclear weapons. What's stopping you? Why not go ahead and sign it?

Not so fast. The United States by its scheme for an M.L.F.—multilateral nuclear force—and the British Government by its proposed A.N.F.—Atlantic nuclear force—also want to set up a Nato nuclear fighting organisation. Thus, while they retained the veto on the use of its bombs, West Germany and other countries would be members of its governing body (with access to all documents), hold posts in its general staff (with access to technical arrangements for allocation and eventual use of the bomb), and hold posts of operational command in its establishments (with the opportunity of studying the actual structure and working of the bomb). This *might* prevent West German generals (all of whom held high military posts under Hitler) from controlling and using American and British nuclear bombs on their own if they remained loyal. Harold Wilson for this reason declared in the House of Commons on May 3 (and on other occasions) that 'the A.N.F. has built-in safeguards against proliferation', and that therefore there would be 'no German finger on the nuclear trigger'.

But if so, why are the West Germans so stubbornly pressing for participation, either in M.L.F. or in an A.N.F.—they don't much care which—and making it the absolute condition for joining a non-dissemination treaty? Why did they send General Hopf, head of the disarmament and arms centre department of their Defence Ministry, to London on July 19 for three days to talk about these matters? How is it that—after the world was told by the Paris Treaties of 1954 that West Germany would never have nuclear weapons—we now have it calmly pointed out (Wayland Young in the *Guardian* of July 22) that under these treaties 'she is barred only from making them in Germany; but remains free to manufacture nuclear weapons *on other people's soil* (*for instance France, Portugal, South Africa*)' and free 'to buy or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons, *made by other people* (*for instance France or China*)'? And how could the West German Foreign Minister Schroeder issue his notorious black-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mail threat, a few weeks ago, that *if* the unilateral force, or an equivalent solution, were created, '*then Germany could offer to renounce the acquisition of her own nuclear weapons*'?

The answer to all these questions is the same: that the peoples of the world have been told lies, ever since 1954, when they were being lulled into complacency by talk about West Germany never getting nuclear weapons. They are still being told lies today, when American and British Ministers talk about 'built-in safeguards'. And this stamps as all the more brazen impudence the statement by Lord Chalfont in Paris that the British draft of a non-dissemination treaty 'does not specifically rule out the extension of nuclear control within the Nato alliance. *Bargaining on this point is out of the question*' (*The Times*, July 26). What the British Labour Government wants is both a non-dissemination treaty and an arrangement within Nato which (by the features noted above) *ensures* dissemination! For Schroeder's remark about 'the acquisition of her own nuclear weapons' does *not* only mean buying or building them abroad. As we have frequently pointed out in these columns, German science and technical skill are fully equal—given the extra opportunities of learning American and British secrets now promised them—to putting the Bonn Government in a position to 'acquire its own nuclear weapons, in some new form as yet secret, from its own manufacturers'.

No wonder the West German Government was very worried when it learned of the proposal of President Johnson's special committee on non-proliferation, headed by former Defence Under-Secretary Gilpatric (but also including John McCloy, former US High Commissioner in Germany)—and supported by Senator Robert Kennedy—that a non-proliferation treaty should be given priority over the proposed M.L.F. (*The Times*, July 2)! No wonder that, after talking to Averill Harriman, U.S. Ambassador-at-large, after his visit to Moscow, *Chancellor Erhard was 'relieved' at discovering that there was 'no immediate prospect of an agreement on non-dissemination of nuclear weapons'* (*The Times*, July 26)! And no wonder, when Lord Chalfont at Geneva proposed *both* a non-dissemination pledge in the treaty *and* an 'escape clause', permitting withdrawal if the M.L.F. or A.N.F. were set up, that the Russians told him in working-class language what he could do with his proposal—one under which the bookmaker accepts your bet, but has a notice up saying—'All money returned, if we welsh'!

It is obvious that the British and American delegates went to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Geneva with the firm determination (i) to ensure (contrary to the express decisions of the T.U.C. and the Labour Party) that West Germany gets no reason to complain of being refused admission to nuclear secrets and know-how, one way or the other, (ii) to ensure that there shall be no agreement against dissemination of nuclear weapons which would hamper this. And to believe otherwise is not only to fly in the face of facts: it is to commit the same tragic error as those trustful millions did who, in 1939, believed (in face of all the evidence) that Chamberlain really wanted an agreement with the Soviet Union to put a muzzle on Hitler, and thus prevent a second world war.

Obviously, when these two major chances of a first real step in disarmament are being sabotaged, the question of nuclear-free zones in Europe and elsewhere (to which the Labour Party was explicitly pledged before its leaders took office last October), and the question of a general cut in armaments which the United Nations General Assembly once again demanded, as recently as June 11, (and the resolution of the Parliamentary Labour Party on August 2, pressing for 'drastic cuts in arms expenditure', shows how realistic the demand was), have had very little chance. And all this, taken together, represents one more blow at the chances of preventing a third world war.

But if the Parliamentary Labour Party can make its voice heard, so much more can the unions and the constituency parties who will be represented at the T.U.C. and the Labour Party Conference, and whose voice the Labour Government must listen to. British working class opinion, forcefully expressed in the teeth of pressure from its American satellite of a Government, will have a powerful echo at Geneva.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BOOKS

The Anatomy of Apartheid, E. S. Sachs. Collets. 424 pp. 45s.
The Elected Monarch, F. W. G. Benemy. George G. Harrap. 272 pp. 16s.
Fringe Benefits, Labour Costs and Social Security, Edited by G. L. Reid and D. J. Robertson. Allen & Unwin. 336 pp. 48s.
The Hussite Movement in Bohemia. J. Macek. Lawrence & Wishart. 120 pp. 7s. 6d.
Revolution and Defeat, D. George Kousoulos. Oxford University Press, 306 pp. 35s.
Equality, R. H. Tawney. Allen & Unwin. 256 pp. 7s. 6d.
Thrusters & Sleepers, PEP Report. Allen & Unwin. 256 pp. 7s. 6d.
India and the Commonwealth, 1885-1929. Allen & Unwin. 288 pp. 40s.
It Was Not in the News, Max Cohen. Hargreaves. 222 pp. 21s.
Guerrilla Warfare, William J. Pomeroy. International Publishers, N.Y. 128 pp. 95 cents.
Peaceful Co-existence, John and Margrit Pittman. International Publishers, N.Y. 160 pp. 95 cents.

BOOKLETS

The Common Market Conspiracy, V. Cheprakov. Central Books. 58 pp. 9d.
Vietnam—U.S. 'Special War', H. Vernon. British Vietnam Committee. 32 pp. 1s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WILLIAM GALLACHER

December 25, 1881—August 12, 1965

LABOUR MONTHLY joins in mourning the loss of William Gallacher and pays honour to his glorious record as a foremost leader and fighter in the cause of the working class, socialism and human liberation.

William Gallacher belongs for ever to the immortal company of the heroic international working class leaders and fighters of the six decades of the twentieth century who led the mass struggles before and during the first world war, helped to found the new Communist Parties, and continued in the front ranks of the battle through all these stormy years.

His wit, his deep humanity, his courage and integrity endeared him to all, even among those opposed to him.

Fearless and unbending before the enemy, he was rich in boundless love and understanding for all who suffered under class or national oppression and who were striving to find their path forward. Defiant of advancing years, he remained always close to young people, and was marching in the Aldermaston March in the very last years of his life. His passionate championship of every liberation struggle of the oppressed people against imperialism won him love and devotion all over the world.

His valiant record of indefatigable service and activity over six decades, always in the forefront wherever the battle was hottest, in prison or out of prison, in parliament or out of parliament, always close to the masses and combining unswerving fidelity to revolutionary principles with shrewd political insight, is enshrined as an imperishable part of the epic of the working class and socialist movement of our era. Through his books *Revolt on the Clyde* and many others he has helped to the understanding of this era.

Our journal has special reason to mourn his loss and honour his memory. From the earliest days of its foundation he, together with Harry Pollitt, was its special inspirer, guide and untiring friend, seeing in it, as he was never tired of expounding to those of us who worked upon it, a favoured instrument to reach out for the purpose for which it was created, to the broad Labour movement and promote understanding and co-operation and unity in action, while maintaining political clarity and fidelity to revolutionary principles. His contributions to our pages were very numerous through all these decades from the nineteen-twenties to last year, and throw an invaluable light on the big events and controversies of our epoch. His last contribution was in May, 1964, when he reviewed Harold Wilson's 'Purpose and Politics' under the title 'Purpose and Mr Wilson'.

Honour to William Gallacher. His example will inspire all who follow him to carry forward the fight for the great aims to which he devoted his entire life—the aims of human liberation and the future classless communist society.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

' WILLIE '

We shall not see again
His brown eyes warm with sympathy,
Eyes hot with class anger
We shall not see :

We shall not hear ring out
His hammer-beat retort,
The humour and the wit
We shall not hear :

We shall not witness more
Hands brush aside the cobweb lies,
His thundered No ! to war
Against six hundred coward Ayes :
Never again.

Yet when
Spring sunlight gleams on stalwart granite
And brown burn chuckles down the brae,
And when streams out his scarlet standard,
Silent, before the trumpets play,
Who will not remember him ?

Angela Tuckett.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUBVERSION IN THE TRADE UNIONS

John Williamson

DURING the last year the storms of controversy have increased within the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions —established in 1949 as a breakaway from the all-inclusive World Federation of Trade Unions on the initiative of the American and British Unions. While it has affiliated membership of 60,000,000 it still remains the smaller of the two world federations, since the announced affiliated membership of the W.F.T.U. is 80,000,000.

Throughout the sixteen year existence of the I.C.F.T.U., it has been the scene of increasing conflicts between its parents, the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labour—Congress of Industrial Organisations (A.F.L.-C.I.O.) and the General Council of the Trades Union Congress.

From the American side, most aggressive have been the A.F.L.-C.I.O. President, George Meany, and Jay Lovestone, Director of the International Department of the A.F.L.-C.I.O., who is Meany's adviser on foreign affairs. These two have inflicted on the American trade union movement a reactionary foreign policy attitude that is indistinguishable from the extreme Right.

The original 1949 aim of making the I.C.F.T.U. a mere anti-Communist weapon in the Cold War runs into continuous difficulties as the workers of its affiliates struggle for higher living standards and concern themselves with united action and peace. This was further accentuated by the affiliation of some newly established trade union centres in the former colonial countries.

Throughout these years the I.C.F.T.U. has been the scene of extensive in-fighting that reflected the different interests of the main imperialist powers. Even the *Telegraph* wrote truly that:

> Each affiliate is concerned to further the national policies of the country to which they belong. Their work is part of the cold war and their methods are those of their governments. (April 5, 1965.)

Undoubtedly Lovestone and Meany saw 'Red' when they read what its Executive felt compelled to write:

> The I.C.F.T.U. is not an instrument in the cold war. It is not the tool of any bloc or government. Its affiliates hold diverse political views.

The current struggle in the I.C.F.T.U., when stripped of its lengthy

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

verbiage about representation in the Executive and the personal character of various of its officials, was essentially the determination of Meany and Lovestone to imitate President Johnson and boss the trade unions of the 'free world'. Meany has said that the two major functions of the I.C.F.T.U. should be (1) to fight the Communist world more vigorously and (2) to use their funds to build up 'safe' trade unions in Africa, Asia and the Middle East; and that it has failed in both.

His demands at the July session were that the I.C.F.T.U. establish a new department to fight Communism, that the A.F.L.-C.I.O. be allowed to proceed unilaterally in Africa and that the actions of the Miners and Printers Trade Secretariats in establishing contact with W.F.T.U. officials 'cannot be countenanced by the I.C.F.T.U.'. Meany was specially outraged at the increasing visits of delegations of I.C.F.T.U. affiliates to the Soviet Union and declared that we 'have nothing to learn from the Communist "unions",' and that 'relations with them are of no value to us'.

Unfortunately, George Woodcock and the other representatives of the T.U.C. failed to reject these reactionary proposals of the Americans openly and on most controversial questions abstained. Past experience should have taught the T.U.C. that they can never appease these American trade union leaders with a stone-age mentality.

For years, only the extreme Left in the United States has continuously exposed the special rôle of Jay Lovestone, the often alleged and never denied 'C.I.A. man in Labour'. The C.I.A. is America's notorious Central Intelligence Agency. Coincidental with the I.C.F.T.U. meeting, there has now appeared a fully documented factual exposé in the liberal magazine *The Nation* (July 5), headed 'Lovestone Diplomacy'. The most significant political charge made against Lovestone Diplomacy is:

> *What the U.S. Government does not do directly because it would be flagrant meddling with the internal affairs of other nations, and what the C.I.A. cannot do because it is suspect, the A.F.L.-C.I.O. does on their behalf* (my emphasis, J.W.).

The naive liberal *Nation* editorially expresses astonishment that Lovestone should play 'a key rôle not merely in orienting the American labour movement well to the right on foreign policy issues, but in setting up a world-wide intelligence network which, throughout the cold war, has worked in close liaison with the official C.I.A.'.

Today through the voices of Meany and Lovestone, the A.F.L.-C.I.O. applauds the bombing of North Vietnam. Concerning L.B.J.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they call for 'support [for] the President in international affairs without reservation' and to impress Congress that 'labour' is fully behind the invasion of Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

Such sordid anti-working-class action on behalf of U.S. imperialism is only the latest of many. In 1955, Lovestone's right-hand man, Irving Brown, called the Geneva Conference 'terrible' because it 'was the beginning of the attainment of one of Russia's long sought objectives—the banning of nuclear warfare'. In 1960 an A.F.L.-C.I.O. Conference in World Affairs was held whose admitted aim was to scuttle any agreement that might have come out of the Paris Conference of Eisenhower and Khrushchev—itself torpedoed by the C.I.A. U-2 flight.

Year after year Meany gives encouragement to the Right-led unions of dockers on the Atlantic Coast to refuse to load or unload ships involved in trade with the Soviet Union, China, Cuba or other Socialist countries. Lovestone himself took issue with Kennan's proposal for reducing tensions between East and West and dismissed it curtly, saying that it 'was wrong', and when U.N.'s U Thant talked of 'competitive co-existence' with the Soviet Union, Lovestone also denounced him. As American voices speak up for peace or for recognising China, Meany and Lovestone lose no time in condemning such proposals.

The Lovestone 'world-wide intelligence network' is surrounded by all the intrigue, espionage, and mysterious money that is common to such work and is in accord with Lovestone's similar rôle in the early Communist movement before he was expelled in 1929.

The open names who direct the operations are well-known to trade unionists throughout the world. In Britain and the Continent, with newly assigned responsibility for Africa, is Irving Brown; in Latin America, Sarafino Romualdi; in East Asia and Japan, Richard Deverall; in Indonesia, Harry Goldberg; and a host of others it would take too long to name. They are now supplemented by so-called 'Labour Attachés' at each of the American Embassies—the great majority of whom, it is claimed, are screened by Lovestone, as Director of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. International Department. The *Nation* article says that 'the A.F.L.-C.I.O. has its own liaison man in the State Department' and names him as George P. Delaney. He has the imposing title of Special Assistant for International Labour Affairs.

But behind the open activity is 'the cloak and dagger realm', as the *Readers Digest* described it. The *New York Times* said of the Free Trade Union Centre in Exile that it 'appears to have at its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disposal a working intelligence division'.

The secret funds, according to Congressman Patman, are covered up by such names as 'The Michigan Fund' and the 'J. M. Kaplan Fund'. The latter, according to Patman, is a 'secret conduit' for the C.I.A. No one knows the extent of the money funnelled into this secret and divisive work of what might be called the 'Lovestone-Meany International'. Right-wing columnist Westbrook Pegler says Lovestone spent 'millions'. Substantiating this and pointing the finger at its source, the *Nation* article says: 'There is no longer a question as to the source of money used by the A.F.L.-C.I.O. in its international work—the bulk of it comes from Government sources'. And it estimates the amount at $110,000,000.

All this American subversion in the trade unions of the world is directed by Jay Lovestone, in his capacity as Director of the International A.F.L.-C.I.O. There are also numerous so-called 'independent' committees. Most well-known in the early days was the Free Trade Union Committee through which Lovestone operated after the close of World War II. Then for Latin America there is the American Institute for Free Labour Development (A.I.F.L.O.), which has a very important Special Projects Department. And most recently established is the African-American Labour Centre. Integrated into all this vast network is the A.F.L.-C.I.O. activity in the I.C.F.T.U., where Irving Brown operates under Lovestone's direction.

The A.F.L.-C.I.O. leaders brazenly boast of their intrigue and splitting activities over the past twenty years. In 1960, A.F.L.-C.I.O. Secretary-Treasurer Schnitzler, referring to Western Europe, said 'our diplomats were helpless' because they 'couldn't speak the language of the workers. It was at this point [we] stepped into the breach. We could speak the language of the workers and we did'.

George Meany himself boasted that 'primarily due to our effort' union after union on the continent was split and 'on the China mainland we are aiding the underground. . . .' Its more recent activities cover Brazil, British Guiana and the Dominican Republic. Attuned to American imperialist interests, it is now directing its main attention to the newly established trade union movement in Africa.

Who is this Jay Lovestone, such an intrepid agent of American imperialism? Thirty-six years ago he was expelled from the C.P.U.S.A. after two decades of factional activities, during which time he was aptly described in the Comintern as 'indisputably an adroit and talented factional wirepuller'. During these 36 years he

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first tried his hand at behind-the-scenes intrigue in the United Auto Workers' Union, where he assisted the short-lived Homer Martin as President in his 'anti-Communist' activities (this included everyone who opposed Martin, inclusive of Walter Reuther) until Martin was exposed as an agent of the employers in the union. He was then employed by the arch-Right-Wing anti-Soviet trade union leader David Dubinsky, who started him on his present rôle by making him secretary of the Free Trade Union Committee. His further activities have already been indicated in this article.

Shameful and sordid as are the policy and actions of Meany and Lovestone, the entire trade union movement in the U.S.A. should not be tagged with this label.

There are disagreements even in the top councils of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. on the Meany-Lovestone activities. But the Reuthers, Potofskys and Hellsteins have not the guts to come out into the open and take the differences to the members. It was left to a Canadian trade union paper to call for Meany's resignation because of his support of troops in the Dominican Republic, where it said resignation 'would be the most important contribution he could make to North American labour'.

In the U.S.A. the open voice of leadership dissent on the Meany-Lovestone support of U.S. imperialist war policy has been limited to a few—docker union leader Harry Bridges, auto union secretary-treasurer Emil Mazey, and some others within the electrical workers, teamsters and building workers. Most significant was a speech of Mazey of the million-member U.A.W., in July, when he stated:

> American boys are bleeding and dying in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic and President Johnson says we are there to fight for freedom and liberty. There is none of either in any of these countries. . . . We are using a Madison Avenue approach to sell a war we should not be in. . . . I don't agree with Geo. Meany that we have to back up the President and have confidence in what he does. . . . You have got to take foreign policy out of the hands of the striped-pants boys. . . . The foreign policy of L.B.J. is . . . leading us down a street that has no end.

There are some in the U.S.A., among the intellectuals especially, who would like to write off the American working class. But the pro-imperialist and class-collaborationist top leadership should not be equated with the millions of trade union members, who carry on the class struggle daily.

The American working class has a glorious tradition of militancy and struggle. Given the understanding of its class interests within the context of the American scene, no one need despair. George Meany, who boasts that he 'never led a picket line' in his lifetime, is not representative of American working men and women.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HIGHLIGHTS OF TRADES

On International Trade Union Unity:

I EXPRESS regret that the desire of the Congress to secure more unity in the International Trade Union Movement has not yet been fully realised. . . . I can conceive of no greater blunder and disservice to the movement than that of raking up all the nasty and bitter statements that have been made during the past four to five years and trying to breathe new life into, and fan into flames, the hatreds arising from war conditions. There is now a new atmosphere, and it is our duty to bend all our energies to the reconstruction of the International Trade Union Movement on the basis of toleration, mutual understanding, and unity of purpose.

There are surely signs over the whole field of industry which indicate that vast and revolutionary changes must take place in industrial structure to meet the changed conditions. Men and women are not going to remain content with a condition of society which condemns millions of human beings to want the necessaries of life, while as a result of education and knowledge they know too well and see quite clearly that nature in its bounteousness can supply all their legitimate needs by the proper organisation of society upon a basis of collective ownership.

(*Speech of the President of the T.U.C., A. B. Swales*).

On Imperialism:

This Trades Union Congress believes that the domination of non-British peoples by the British Government is a form of capitalist exploitation having for its object the securing for British capitalists (1) of cheap sources of raw materials; (2) the right to exploit cheap and unorganised labour to degrade the workers' standards in Great Britain. It declares its complete opposition to Imperialism, and resolves: (1) to support the workers in all parts of the British Empire to organise the Trade Unions and political parties in order to further their interest, and (2) to support the rights of all peoples in the British Empire to self-determination, including the right to choose complete separation from the Empire.

(*Resolution moved by A. A. Purcell, M.P., Furnishing Trades Association and President, International Federation of Trade Unions, 1925.*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNION CONGRESS, 1925

Report of Visit to Russia:

As a result of our visit to Russia and the issue of our report, we have had an unprecedented attack made upon the Trade Union Movement in this country. . . . Let me call your attention to a very important fact, namely, that the Russian revolution was the first revolution in all history aiming at and securing the overthrow of economic exploitation. It is also the first great national experiment of working-class control, giving expression . . . to the resolutions we have passed at Trades Union Congresses for many years. Russia is a Socialist Republic; and I want to call your attention to the fact that it is the only revolution, it is the only economic change, which has received the universal condemnation without racial discrimination of the possessing and exploiting class of Europe. The Russian experiment, and what arises from it, has demonstrated an important fact. It appears that you can cut off the heads of kings, you can abolish royal families, you can imprison your emperors—as they have done in Austria and Germany—you can permit world wars leading to universal devastation and universal slaughter, and you can be forgiven and accepted into the comity of nations. You can change your political institutions as you will and all is well. But if you disturb the landed interest of a country and abolish the exploitation of the wage-earner, deal with the factory exploiter and get rid of the privilege, property, and power possessed by a minority, then you will have to face what Russia is now facing—isolation, boycott, and international persecution. Russia from our point of view, is a nation at bay. We consider it our duty to stand by the working-class movement of Russia.

(*Speech by the Secretary of the General Council, Fred Bramley.*)

In Support:

This Resolution was simply a clear definition of what the policy of the working-class movement should be towards the subject peoples of the Empire. British Imperialism meant the appalling conditions they saw today amongst the textile workers of Bombay and Calcutta, it meant women going down the mines and doing 36 hours' work at a stretch, and it meant that the people had no right of combination and no legal redress. Imperialism meant the slavery which existed in Kenya at the present time. . . . The Indian workers could not hold a strike meeting without being shot. The Egyptians could not go on strike without being shot. China was being held down by Britain and America. If they passed this resolution they would give a message of encouragement and hope to their fellow workers all over the world.

(*Speech by Harry Pollitt, Boilermakers*).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHO IS THE LEPER NOW?

Dipak Nandy*

THERE is a new mood amongst Britain's coloured people today —a mood of humiliation, of bitterness and anger. Not so long ago every discussion of the racial situation in this country would end, as likely as not, with the words: 'The Labour Party will do something about it'. In that hope many coloured people worked for the Labour Party, canvassed for it, and in some areas (like Southall) their votes played an important part in Labour's victory. The shattering of that hope, naive in the extreme as it seems now, has left them feeling resentful and angry. Politicians will from now on have to reckon with that feeling.

The first blow came in October and November of last year, when the Labour Government not only extended the operation of the Commonwealth Immigration Act of 1962, but seemed excessively anxious about 'evasions' of the Act they had themselves fought tooth and nail two years before. Shortly after came the proposals for tightening up the operation of the Act, with the threat of further measures if these were not adequate.

Then, in April 1965, after over a decade, Fenner Brockway's Bill to outlaw racialism made its appearance—in the disguise of the Race Relations Bill. It was something of a masterpiece of its kind. Not only was there no mention of the two critical areas of discrimination—employment and housing—but in the areas it did propose to tackle, a set of proceedings was devised so crude and cumbersome that it was doubtful whether the legislation would work at all. When criticisms of the Bill were voiced (CARD presented a most painstaking and detailed memorandum on the subject) the Government declared its willingness to accept amendments of parts of the Bill. Since then we have seen the shameful spectacle of the Government accepting amendments in alliance with the Tories (ably led by Peter Griffiths) against its own backbenchers and others, both Liberal and Conservative.

The third blow came in June, with the Department of Education Circular on 'The Education of Immigrants'. In its lack of clarity (*e.g.*, the definition of 'immigrant children'), in its total evasion of what figures and statistics are available, in its arbitrariness (the magic figure of thirty per cent as the proper ratio of immigrant to non-immigrant children), above all in its utter lack of concern for

*Dipak Nandy is Chairman of the Leicester Campaign for Racial Equality, and a member of the National Council of CARD (Campaign against Racial Discrimination).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or consultation with the people who were to be directly affected—the coloured people—that circular sets a new standard for British public policy documents.

And finally, in the last days of Labour's first session in Parliament, came the White Paper, *Immigration from the Commonwealth*. To the student of contemporary politics, this White Paper is bound to appear as an historic document—it marks the moment when the Labour leadership finally capitulated to racialist pressures, both outside its ranks and within.

The contents of that White Paper are by now well known. Briefly they are these: As from August 2, 1965, there will be only 8,500 Ministry of Labour vouchers issued per year, as against just over 20,000 a year previously. Of the three categories under which vouchers were issued, the third, Category C, is to be discontinued. Vouchers will continue to be issued to those with a specific job to come to, and to specially qualified people: doctors, dentists, nurses, scientists, technologists, and teachers. Of the prospective immigrant's dependants, only his wife and children under 16 will be allowed in as of right.

In keeping with this Government's sensitiveness to 'evasions' of the Act, new measures are proposed to control this deplorable habit of the coloured races. Certain categories of Commonwealth citizens, previously allowed unconditional entry, are now to enter on conditions imposed 'at the discretion of the immigration officer'. Finally, the Home Secretary will be given powers of 'repatriation', 'if he considers the public interest to require it'.

Readers will note that none of these proposals is new. They were being put forward, from the mid-1950's, by each and every 'Immigration Control Association' in the country, by Sir Cyril Osborne, Peter Griffiths, and by all those who believe that the only way in which Britain can solve the colour problem is by not having any coloured people around.

A more cynical and inhumane piece of legislation it would be difficult to imagine. In the first place, underlying each word printed here is the view contained in this White Paper, that coloured people are *in themselves* 'problem people', that it is the very presence of coloured people which causes racial problems. If readers doubt this, they may care to turn to p. 10 where, after specifying in exemplary detail how the Government proposes to keep coloured immigrants out, the White Paper turns to that most nebulous section, Part III, to consider the problem of 'Integration'. After a concession

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(costing nothing) about the 'most valuable contribution to our economy' made by coloured people, the Paper goes on:

> At the same time it must be recognised that the presence in this country of nearly one million immigrants from the Commonwealth with different social and cultural backgrounds raises a number of problems and creates various social tensions in those areas where they have concentrated.

What problems? What tensions? The housing problem is not 'raised' by the 'different social and cultural backgrounds' of immigrants. And would the housing problem be any less acute if a million Irish and European workers had come into this country instead of a million coloured people?† Is it the 'presence' of coloured people that 'creates' social tensions? Or is it perhaps the 'presence' of *prejudice* (that cannot tolerate people who are 'different')? No discussion of race relations can get off the ground which does not recognise that the 'colour problem', 'the problem of immigrants', and all those other euphemisms we use, amounts to nothing more or less than *the problem of prejudice and discrimination.* The White Paper takes the tempting—and dishonest—way out by adopting implicitly the sedulously propagated racialist thesis that coloured people themselves are the cause of racial problems.

In the second place, a Labour Government has now publicly declared that, as its contribution to International Co-operation Year and to aiding the poorer Commonwealth countries, it is proposing to take from poor nations one of the scarcest, most priceless, resources—their *trained people.* As Dr. David Pitt, Chairman of CARD, put it recently: 'They want our doctors. They want our nurses. They want our scientists and technologists. But they don't want our ordinary people'. To these sordid depths has the 'New Britain' sunk. Simple humanitarianism, not to mention socialist principle in this context, might have nagged the framers of this White Paper into deleting this shameful proposal from their pages.

Thirdly, the new figure of 8,500 (or 7,500 for the Commonwealth) itself requires consideration. *The number of vouchers issued can be highly misleading.* For example, in the first year and a half of the Immigration Act, *only* 53 *per cent of the vouchers issued were actually taken up,* At the proposed rate of issue of 7,500 a year, immigration from the Commonwealth has not merely been restrained—it has virtually been choked. And if we look at the facts of immigration into this country for the last year, something of

†Sir Milner Holland, Q.C., speaking at a Kensington meeting on March 31, said: 'Coloured immigrants are not the cause of the housing shortage. If coloured immigration was banned, immigrants would come from Ireland or elsewhere.' (*Daily Express,* April 1.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the prejudiced logic of this White Paper begins to emerge. The following suggestive table shows the direction in which immigration policy is moving:

	1963	1964	% change
Entry into Britain of Commonwealth (i.e. coloured) workers	30,125	14,705	−51%
Entry into Britain of alien (i.e. white) workers	39,683	42,554	+ 6·8%

The British economy needs extra workers to meet its chronic post-war labour shortage. The Government is in effect turning off one tap and turning on another.

No one pretends that the housing problem will be eased one bit. No one pretends that schools will find it any easier to deal with non-English-speaking alien children than with coloured children. Nor are the 'different social and cultural backgrounds' going to be erased—as British tourists to the Continent testify summer after summer. The only difference is that, by riding roughshod over coloured people, Labour M.P.s have proved that *they* are no 'nigger-lovers'. Colour will not, at least in the very short run (and that is all that Harold Wilson cares about), prove quite such a political liability to the Labour Party as it did a year ago.

Many other points can be made. There is, for those concerned to improve race relations, the stark contrast in this document between the stringent and specific detail of the measures to control immigration and the pious generalities which masquerade as positive proposals for integration. In the section dealing with housing, for example, the whole discussion is based on the assumption that the immigrants are somehow responsible for the wretched housing conditions in which they live: 'The *main cause* of unsatisfactory living conditions among immigrants is the multiple occupation of houses originally designed for only one family' (p. 11; my italics). Anyone capable of thinking consistently for two minutes on the subject will realise that multi-occupation, far from being the *cause* of unsatisfactory living conditions, is the *result*, first of the failure of successive Governments to make any provisions for the immigrant workers on whose backs they have ridden to 'never-had-it-so-good' affluence, and secondly of the widespread discrimination in housing to which they have turned (and continue to turn, *pace* the Race Relations Bill) a blind eye. The British Government has spent upward of £34,000 on a Royal Commission to report on housing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

problems in London, the Milner Holland Report. Were the drafters of this White Paper unable to procure a copy of that report, or were they perhaps not sufficiently literate to read it? For in Chapter 9 of the *Report of the Committee on Housing in Greater London* we are told that, apart from the difficulties which immigrants experience in common with other newcomers, 'for coloured immigrants these difficulties are accentuated by *a marked degree of reluctance* to make rented accommodation available to them (p. 194; my italics). This is restrained Blue-Book prose, but its meaning is unequivocal: discrimination. What does the White Paper propose in the way of positive measures? Consider the following passage:

> Local housing authorities already have a wide range of powers, which, *if judiciously used, can make* a major contribution to this end. *As time goes on,* immigrants will qualify for rehousing by local authorities either by virtue of residential qualifications or through being displaced by slum clearance or other redevelopment. *Thus it will become commonplace* for Commonwealth immigrants to be rehoused by local authorities in pursuance of their normal statutory responsibilities. This in itself *will tend to break up* excessive and undesirable concentrations. . . . Local authorities, *it is hoped,* do their utmost to assist and promote housing associations which have integration as one of their aims (p. 11; my italics).

Anyone with the slightest notion of the complex of problems created by the discrimination and prejudice in housing will realise what the Government is doing: it is simply 'whistling in the dark'. If problems could be wished away so easily, we should be in Paradise now.

This White Paper is a milestone: it marks the extent to which the leadership of the Labour Party has shed every scrap of principle in its single-minded quest for electoral popularity.

In October 1964, in his opening address on the Queen's Speech, Harold Wilson uttered some trenchant and forceful words:

> Is the Leader of the Opposition proud of his Honourable Friend the Member for Smethwick? Does he now intend to take him to his bosom? Will the Conservative whip be extended to him, because if he does accept him as a colleague he will make this clear: *he will betray the principles which not only his party but also his nation have hitherto had the right to proclaim.* And if he does not, if he takes what I think is the right course . . . the Smethwick Conservatives can have the satisfaction of having topped the poll, and of having sent here as their Member one who until a further General Election restores him to oblivion, will serve his term here as a Parliamentary leper (my italics).

And all because Peter Griffiths had the nerve to get elected by cracking the racialist whip. But where have those principles gone which were so prominent last October? Who is the leper now?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When the White Paper was published, there was gloom amongst all those who have been working to improve race relations in this country. The only sound of jubilation came from the Immigration Control Associations—the reactionaries and their allies.And understandably. All those who work in the field of race relations agree that the racial situation presents a bleak prospect in the coming years. The racialists and reactionaries have scented blood and they will not let up. And why should they? Views which barely two years ago might have been characterised as 'extremist' and 'inflammatory' are now being promulgated by a Labour Government. The future is with the racialists.

All those who have pinned their faith on the organised labour movement, on the solidarity and unity in the face of reactionary pressures and divisive forces, will look forward with concern to the Trades Union Congress at Brighton. Year after year the T.U.C. has passed resolutions on *apartheid* in South Africa. What will it say of the White Paper on Immigration? Will it acquiesce and pass by in silence? Or will British trade unionists speak up for that justice and the common humanity and the principles which the Labour Government has so callously betrayed?

LABOUR MONTHLY FORTY YEARS AGO

PLUS ÇA CHANGE . . .

They called it the 'Commonwealth' Labour Conference on the principle of the clever ostrich which sticks its head into the sand and believes its pursuers outwitted. But an Empire, five-sixths of whose inhabitants are subject to capitalist exploitation, and which is maintained by sheer military coercion, does not become a 'commonwealth' by a little sleight of hand. . . . The Conference was a hang-over from the days of the Labour Government and its policy of Continuity. It was conceived to demonstrate to the British bourgeoisie that Labour was quite as safely imperialistic (and 'fit to govern') as the Tories, only more so. . . . In his key-note speech welcoming the delegates, MacDonald made all this quite clear. 'There seems to be an assumption in this country', he declared, 'that the Tory Party, the party of Reaction, is the only party that cares anything about the Empire. This was so much fudge and humbug,' a declaration that was warmly received in the Tory Press.

(From 'The Empire Labour Conference', *Labour Monthly*, September 1925.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GOING BACK TO ODESSA

Judah Waten

[*Judah Waten is widely known as a novelist and short story writer in Australia. His work has been translated into many languages. Three of his novels deal with the life of Jewish migrants in Australia. His latest novel* Distant Land *won the* £200 *Melbourne Moomba award for the best Australian novel of* 1964. *It was published in England early this year.*

Judah Waten has written this article for Labour Monthly *after travelling in Europe where he attended the International Writers conference in Weimar and the PEN International Congress at Bled. —Ed.*, L.M.]

I WAS fourteen days old when I left Odessa back in 1911. My mother had specially come to Odessa from Palestine to give birth to me, her first born, in my father's city, where his parents and many relatives lived. My father and mother never saw Odessa again, nor Russia for that matter, but to the end of their days they never ceased to talk about Odessa. Fifty-three years later I decided to visit the city of my birth and wondered if I had any relatives left there. I had an uncle Matis and an Aunt Malke in Moscow and I would ask them.

Soon after I arrived in Moscow I was interviewed on TV and Aunt Malke saw me and she rang my hotel the following morning. In Yiddish she said to me: 'I cried all night. To think that I saw the son of my brother whom I saw last in 1911. I was sixteen then. I remember him as if I had seen him yesterday.' I had to come to her house, she said.

A few nights later with my wife and daughter I went to my aunt's house on the outskirts of Moscow in a suburb that not very long ago was a village. It was a quaint looking but stout four-roomed timber house with a kind of painted embroidery around the window frames. My aunt and her husband had built it with money lent by the Government. There was a garden with fruit trees in the front and back of the house and there would be flowers in the summer.

We were met on the front porch by Aunt Malke, aged seventy, and Uncle Matis, aged eighty, who is a childless widower and a pensioner, a former worker in a textile factory. Waiting for us inside were at least another fourteen relatives. There was Malke's husband, a bald-headed portly man of seventy odd, a retired warehouse mana-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ger, and their two handsome middle-aged daughters with their husbands and grown-up children and grandchildren, the youngest of whom wore a red pioneer scarf. My aunt and uncle introduced us around.

My aunt, a blunt-spoken woman, evidently accustomed to taking charge, sat herself down at the head of the table that was loaded with all the traditional Russian-Jewish dishes. She placed me on her left and Uncle Matis on her right. Malke, Matis and I spoke in Yiddish but apart from my aunt's bald-headed husband most of the rest of the gathering found great difficulty in following her conversation. My aunt's husband translated the Yiddish into Russian for them while I translated into English for my wife and daughter's sake. It was like an international conference and every minute it grew noisier.

My aunt was both critical and apologetic about the younger generation's lack of knowledge of Yiddish. 'Admittedly,' she said, 'young ones today have so much more to know. Science and languages. You have to learn English if you want to get anywhere.' (And in fact most of the younger people were studying mainly engineering and science.) Her bald-headed husband joined in. 'It's a long time since I read a Yiddish book,' he said looking shamefaced. What with bottling the fruit from the trees in his garden, watching TV and reading and collecting articles on international affairs, for which he had a passion, he had little time left for anything else. Several of the younger people said they occasionally read a Yiddish book in Russian translation.

How they loved music in Odessa, my uncle rhapsodised. The opera house was more beautiful than La Scala, he had heard tell. 'Our branch of the family went in for music and literature,' I said. 'We have continued an Odessa tradition.' 'Your mother was very friendly with many writers in Odessa,' my aunt said. 'When you were born Bialik came to see her and congratulated her.' 'Odessa produced some of our greatest musicians,' Uncle Matis said. 'Soloists, members of orchestras. Oistrakh and many more.' I asked if there were any relatives, even very distant ones, left in Odessa. 'No, No' Malke said. 'All those who stayed on after we left for Moscow in 1925 were killed by the nazis. Men, women and children, there were over sixty of them.'

My aunt's son-in-law, a stern-faced factory engineer who had been a captain in the army during the war and had taken part in the capture of Königsberg, told us he recited *Kaddish* every year on the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anniversary of the death of his parents at the hands of the nazis in Odessa. It was the only time he went to a synagogue. His wife, my cousin, went more frequently. She liked the service and she liked meeting Jews. I had the impression that both of them were rather intense Jews. They were both of Jewish nationality which was recorded on their passports, a voluntary decision, for I met other Jews who preferred to be of Russian or Ukrainian nationality.

'On the New Year and *Yom Kippur*, the synagogue is packed,' my cousin said, 'and people stand out in the street. You would be surprised at the people you would meet there. Professors, writers, doctors, army officers.' 'Not so many,' disputed my old Uncle Matis who never went to synagogue.

When it came time for us to leave he said: 'On your way to Odessa don't forget to stop off in Kiev for a few days. Your father often went to Kiev.' I took my uncle's advice. The Writer's Union of the Ukraine was informed that an Australian writer and his family wanted to stay in Kiev for a few days and we were met at the railway station by one of the Union's officials, Mr. Kazimirov. He was a Jew but he couldn't speak Yiddish, although he could understand it fairly well. So I spoke to him in Yiddish and he answered me in Russian which I hardly understand at all. However, gradually we managed to devise a new kind of Jewish language which we both understood, a mixture of Yiddish, German, Hebrew, Russian and Ukrainian.

'Sixty years ago,' I told him, 'when my father was travelling from Odessa to Warsaw he bought a book of Sholem Aleichem stories at a kiosk on the Kiev station.' It turned out that Mr. Kazimirov was a Sholem Aleichem enthusiast although he had only read the great Yiddish writer in Ukrainian translation. Ukrainian writers as well as Jewish ones had taken part in the translations of his work which is very popular in the Ukraine. One of the first places Mr. Kazimirov took me to was the house Sholem Aleichem had lived in and my wife photographed us standing near the plaque commemorating Sholem Aleichem's residence there.

Later in the day we were joined by the distinguished Yiddish novelist, Yechiel Falikman, who showed us through the district of Podol where Jews lived in Sholem Aleichem's time and still do. There are still many Jews in Kiev, a high percentage of them intellectuals. During our stay I spoke with a number of them at the university. Once in the street I spoke to a Jew selling fruit at a stall; he said: 'I have seen everything now, a Jew from Australia. What lan-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guage do they speak there?' 'English,' I said. 'You're Englishmen then' he said. Before I left he said: 'Are you going to let those nazis in West Germany get atom bombs? They still walk on their hands and they have the *chutzpah* to demand atom bombs.' The Jews in Kiev suffered terribly at the hands of the nazis and are intensely suspicious of the West German Government. We talked about this as we looked at Babi Yar where so many of the Kiev Jews were driven to their destruction.

Yechiel Falikman had just completed a novel about the heroic and tragic defence of Kiev before the nazis finally overran the city. He had been a soldier himself in the Ukraine throughout all the years of the war and he was filled with poignant memories of the Kiev defenders including their brave Commander-in-Chief, Col-General Kirponess who fell in battle. Falikman was proud of the part played by Jewish soldiers, over a hundred of whom had won the highest award of 'Hero of the Soviet Union,' the Jews being among the people with the highest proportion of decorated heroes. There were several Jews among the thirty-four heroes of the war buried in the Kiev Park of Eternal Glory which we visited with him.

I said to Falikman: 'Will many people read your book?' 'Yes, I think so,' he said. 'In Yiddish?' I asked. 'More in Ukrainian and Russian translations,' he answered. 'Take my word we Yiddish writers thank heaven for translations. We have increased our public by millions of readers.'

'In the West, official Jewish bodies and newspapers are very concerned about the fate of Yiddish in the Soviet Union,' I said. 'But are they concerned about the fate of Yiddish in their own countries?' Falikman said. 'How many people read Yiddish books in Australia? Or in England?' I couldn't tell him exactly but there weren't many I agreed.

At last we arrived in Odessa, my birthplace. We went to an hotel in the beautiful street facing the waterfront, not far from the famous staircase immortalised in Eisenstein's film *Potemkin*. In this hotel, Chekhov, Gorki, Kuprin and Bunin were supposed to have stayed. This was part of the world my father inhabited. We walked around the truly impressive opera house and down the busy Deribasovska street. We came across Sholem Aleichem street but I never could discover what it was called in my father's time. Not far away, over a bookshop, there was a plaque commemorating the fact that Isaac Babel, the great Russian-Jewish writer, had lived there once. Many writers had lived in Odessa, Sholem Aleichem, Paustov-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sky, Bagritsky, Kataev, Petrov and Ilf. Mendele, the founder of Yiddish literature, is buried there and his grave is well cared for and is something of a shrine for lovers of Yiddish literature.

There was much that was old in Odessa and so much that was new. In vain I would have looked for Sholem Aleichem's and Babel's characters. The crooks, the rich merchants, the paupers were gone. But the famous music school founded by Stolyarsky, which has turned out most of the great Russian violinists, was still there. We dropped in to hear a concert given by a lady violin teacher there. The hall was crowded with young boys and girls, eager music students and just as in the past many were Jewish and some of the parents amongst whom we sat spoke in Yiddish.

We met Jews everywhere, not only amongst the writers. In a sanatorium we visited, the assistant medical director was a Jewish lady who had won many decorations in the war. There were other Jewish doctors on the staff and I spoke Yiddish with them. In a large clothing factory the director was Jewish and he told me he had started life as a *Yeshiva* boy. There were skilled Jewish cutters who were among the most esteemed workers in the factory. The Jewish world of traders, of peddlers, and *luftmenschen* was dead but the Jews were not dead. The Jewish world of Odessa today was a world of intellectuals and skilled workers with the same opportunities as all other citizens.

A group of writers, Ukrainian, Russian and Yiddish, gave us a farewell party in the Odessa hotel. Then the Yiddish poet Weinemann said to me: 'We have changed just like you in the West. Different maybe, but great changes there have been. You are not the same as your father. And there will be more changes. But some people in the West think change is good for them but not for us. They would have liked us to stay in Sholem Aleichem's time.' And he spoke of the great contribution made by Odessa Jews to Soviet culture, literature, science, music and industry. We all played together the local game of listing the names of famous writers, musicians and scholars born in Odessa. 'The world is divided between those who were born in Odessa and those who weren't,' one of the Ukrainian writers said.

I came to the conclusion it wasn't a bad thing that I was born in Odessa.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONALISATION: A LIVE ISSUE

(Our readers may be interested to see the number and scope of Resolutions on Nationalisation to be put before the 64th Annual Conference of the Labour Party in Blackpool in September. For reasons of space, some are only reprinted in part.—Ed. *L.M.*)

On Public Ownership:

This Conference calls upon the National Executive Committee to set up an immediate enquiry into which industries should in accordance with Clause IV of the Party Constitution, next be brought into *public ownership*, so that the policy of the Party may be declared as soon as feasible for the next General Election. . . .

Doncaster Constituency Labour Party.

. . . In order to effect a real change in society and to organise a plan of production the Labour Government must take over the 'commanding heights of the economy', as a minimum the *nationalisation* of the banks, insurance companies and the 400 monopolies which control the greatest part of the wealth of the country with compensation on the basis of need. . . .

Wandsworth, Clapham Constituency Labour Party.

This Conference, considering that it is its duty to work for the establishment of a Socialist Britain, and being aware that Socialism is unattainable as long as the financial control of the economy is in private hands, calls on the Government to prepare plans for the immediate transfer of such control to the people, by means of *public control* of the joint-stock banks, the merchant banks, the insurance companies, the building societies, the various hire purchase organisations and the constituent member firms of the Stock and other Exchanges. . . .

Hackney Central Constituency Labour Party.

This Conference calls upon the Labour Government to *socialise* the chemical, aircraft, building and engineering industries in order that the wealth and power of these industries be used to raise the living standards of the people and to weaken the stranglehold of private capital. . . .

Ruislip-Northwood Constituency Labour Party.

On Steel:

This Conference reaffirms its belief in the need for the *nationalisation* of steel industry and urges the Government to take all necessary steps to ensure that legislation is passed during this session of Parliament.

Hendon North Constituency Labour Party.

This Conference affirms that the Government should accept no compromise on the *nationalisation* of steel as set out in the White Paper.

Goole Constituency Labour Party.

On Incomes, Prices and Productivity:

This Conference takes the view that the Government may not find it possible to devise an incomes policy which really does apply to all incomes so long as industry is run for the profit of private shareholders. It will only be possible to produce an incomes policy based on social justice, to achieve the 'most equitable distribution that may be possible' of the National income by taking steps to 'secure for workers by hand and by brain the full fruits of their in-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dustry upon a basis of *common ownership*'. . . .

Fulham Constituency Labour Party.

This Conference calls upon the Government to . . . establish *public ownership* and democratic control of industries, services and major organs of investment, wherever private ownership conflicts with national interest.

Cardiff North Constituency Labour Party.

On Fuel and Power:

This Conference calls upon the Government to take into *public ownership* the distribution of solid fuel.

Birmingham, Aston Constituency Labour Party.

This Conference urges that the Government conduct a full enquiry into the running of the mining industry; *nationalise* the retail coal sales and manufacture of mining equipment. . . .

Nuneaton Constituency Labour Party.

On Transport:

This Conference considers that the present chaotic conditions in the transport system can only be adequately met by *nationalisation* of the transport industry and calls upon the present Government to implement such a policy as a matter of urgency.

Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers & Firemen.

This Conference urges the Government to fulfil the promise made to integrate the road and rail transport systems under *public ownership.*

Swindon Constituency Labour Party.

On Aircraft Industry:

This Conference . . . urges that the Government press the private firms in aircraft production to rationalise along the lines urged by the Trades Union Congress, as being essential to industry's efficiency. *Public ownership* can then be instituted at a later stage with the minimum of dislocation.

Battersea South Constituency Labour Party.

On Housing:

. . . Conference proposes that the Government fix a National Housing Target of 500,000 local authority built houses. To assist local authorities to achieve this object, the Government must take all measures, *including nationalisation,* to ensure adequate land at prices free from the unscrupulous exploitation of private interests. . . . .

Amalgamated Society of Boilermakers, Shipwrights, Blacksmiths and Structural Workers.

On Land:

This Conference views with concern the rocketing price of land, and urges the Government to speed the process of taking into *public ownership* all land other than that scheduled for agricultural purposes.

Deptford Constituency Labour Party.

On Building and Construction Industry:

This Conference requests the Labour Government to explore the possibility of bringing into *public ownership* the Building and Construction Industry.

Barkston Ash Constituency Labour Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEW

Redundancy and the Railwaymen

Dorothy Wedderburn

Cambridge University Press. 240 pp. 20s.

THE TITLE of this book is misleading, as it deals only with shopmen and even then only in detail with redundancy at the former railways workshops, Gorton and Faverdale.

This is unfortunate because shopmen, turners, fitters etc., are the only manual skilled railway workers who can leave the industry and use their skill elsewhere. Railway engine-drivers, signalmen, highly skilled traffic staff and others, join the ranks of the unskilled when they are forced to leave. The book entirely ignores this vital aspect of railway redundancy.

On a number of occasions reference is made to the enlightened attitude of the British Transport Commission and the British Railways Board to redundancy. As one who took an active part in almost all the redundancy negotiations on the N.U.R. side, I certainly never saw any glimpse of this enlightenment at any time. Any concessions were wrung from the Railway Management by the most extreme form of protest including national and district strikes. In the main it was the national one-day strike of 1962 and the threat of the national three-day strike in 1963 which forced the major redundancy concessions from the management.

Several references are made to the necessity of workshop redundancy as part of the modernisation of railways. Here again the main point is missed. In the 'steam era' the entire locomotive was built by the B.R. Workshops. In diesel and electric locomotive building only the clothing (i.e. the shells) are built in B.R. Workshops. All diesel and electric engines, gearings etc., are manufactured entirely by private enterprise; not one engine is allowed to be made in a B.R. workshop. When this decision was taken in the mid-fifties, it was inevitable that the replacement of steam by diesel and electric must mean large scale redundancy in the nationalised workshops. It was the determination of the Tory Government to give the lucrative part of locomotive building to private enterprise which created the basic redundancy situation in the workshops and not modernisation of railways.

Despite these severe criticisms I found the details of redundancy at Gorton and Faverdale quite interesting and informative. The replies of the redundant men to questionnaires form a pattern most workers can well understand. 'Fear of unemployment', 'unwillingness to move to strange districts to take other jobs', 'skilled men not prepared to take unskilled work' and so on. There is nothing new in all this, it has formed part of working class life for many decades. However, if the modern sociologist thinks that the study of the Labour Market is better served by recording all this on paper then the book will have served its purpose.

DAVE BOWMAN.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COLOUR BLIND

THE shameful intentions of the Government, made clear in their White Paper on Immigration, have created disgust, disillusionment, and anger amongst people here and in the Commonwealth countries concerned.

The contrast between the treatment accorded to emigrés scuttling from socialist countries and that meted out to citizens of what the Establishment here were for so long pleased to call the British Empire is certainly an odious one. Our friends here and abroad haven't been slow to draw the obvious conclusions. 'My whole family is shocked at this betrayal', writes a West Indian reader. 'Now we can see clearly who our real friends are. Please have this small gift to help you fight against discrimination'.

From Wales comes a fervent plea to 'expose the dangerous implications of this White Paper. We expected this kind of thing from the Tories, but had great hopes of the new Government'. An Indian friend writing from Scotland has some pungent comments to make, but space only allows this brief extract: 'Useful in war, but enemies in peace-time, seems to be the Government line on Commonwealth citizens', he writes. '*L.M.* has always played an honourable part in revealing the roots of racialism. Please keep the pressure up until this evil thing is wiped out'.

Yes, we certainly will 'keep the pressure up'. Now we need the help of you all to get the widest circulation possible for *L.M.*

Helen Falber.

£40.15s.1d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: B. W. McKay, 3s; L'Humanité, 5s; S. Morrissy, 10s; Blackburn Branch (plus extra), 10s 6d; Oldham Branch, 4s; S. Bates, 10s; Butcher family, 10s; G.I., 2s 6d; F.G.A. (Canada), £1; Marie Philibert, 10s; J. Austin Smith, 5s; R.F.B., £3; A. Corbett, £1; D. J. Perry, 2s 6d; H. Brindle, 5s; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 3s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; 'S. Mill', £1; D. H. Strathern and friends, 10s; 'Oliver Twist and friends', 15s; E. Sheldon, 10s; Nellie Usher, 2s 6d; J. E. Atkinson, 14s 10d; Ben Ainley, £1; Pax, 5s; Two Tynesiders, 5s; M. Illing, £1 10s; Southend Branch, 12s 6d; D. J. Perry, 2s 6d; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include. P. Wallis, 19s; H. F. Westney, 19s; M. Hurwitt, £1 19s; Dr. Hewlett Johnson, 3s; R. G. Willers, 4s; R. Smillie, 5s; T. Graham, 9s; R. G. Fowler, £1; A. S. Dopson, 19s; E. S. Williams, £1 1s; R. Grindley, 19s; I.M. (for G.V.), 9s; H.B., 4s; K. Biggs, 2s; W. Chester, 3s; H. Ludford, 7s; S. Fraser, 19s; J. M. Higginton, £1 1s; R. Gibbs, 5s; C.H.B., £2; 'J.', £2; E. McGregor, 3s; Mr. and Mrs. Perl, 9s; M. Bell, 9s; A.B. (Canada), £2; B.H. and V.C. (U.S.A.), £2 18s 3d; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op. No. L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Weekend Discussion Conference on

"THE ECONOMIC POLICY OF POST-WAR TORY AND LABOUR GOVERNMENTS"

Surrey Crest International Holiday Centre, Godstone, Surrey

October 9th and 10th, 1965

All-in cost: **50**/- (arrival Friday night to Sunday after tea)

10/- deposit

"Incomes Policy," the nationalised industries, the economic situation and future of Great Britain, are some of the topics which will be discussed.

Details and booking forms from The Education Department, Communist Party, 16 King Street, London W.C.2.

LABOUR RESEARCH

'Tories v. Unions'

'Deathbed for Rates'

1s. or 1s. 3d. by post

Labour Research Department
78, Blackfriars Rd., London, S.E.1

Binder Bros. Ltd.

Building and decorating by craftsmen

TOTtenham 2362

MIMETTE FURS LTD.

Wide range of furs, coats, stoles and capes.

117, High Street, Croydon, Surrey.
'Phone CROydon 4328

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD

Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.
Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27, Bedford St. Strand, London W.C.2

LABOUR MONTHLY BOUND VOLUMES

'Priceless as a living history of this epoch . . . '

(A. L. Morton)

Treasures the 'stately homes' do not possess

Complete your library now

Write for price list to:

The Manager, Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to: 'Class Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

WE BUY BOOKS, pamphlets: Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: PRO 7254. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Liffords Pl., S.W.13.

KENT—RAMSGATE & DISTRICT. For details of properties for sale apply: LESLIE HOGBIN & PARTNERS, 48, Queen Street, Ramsgate. Tel. Thanet 53222.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now out

THE FREEDOM OF ART

Honor Arundel

A lively and provocative discussion of the artist's freedom, his responsibilities, and the development of a truly popular art

Paper covers **8s 6d**

Appearing this month

FROM RIGHT TO LEFT

D. N. Pritt

"tireless and incorruptible in defence of anyone whom he regarded as a victim—of reaction of any kind"—*Guardian*

"this man remains monolithically and exasperatingly consistent" *Times Lit. Supp.*

42s

EDUCATION AND THE LABOUR MOVEMENT 1870–1920

Brian Simon

The second volume of *Studies in the History of Education*; traces the efforts of organised Labour to secure equal opportunities for all in education

16 pp illus. **50s**

LAWRENCE & WISHART

WHY NOT BY POST?

It's quicker
— and it's cheaper too!

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

I enclose 21s. (Overseas, 24s., Canada and USA, $3.50), for year's subscription from the

..... issue.

(SIGNED) .....

To LABOUR MONTHLY

134, BALLARDS LANE,

LONDON, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED